

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1859.

## POLICY OF ACTING UPON THE TARIFF AT THE PRESENT SESSION.

An important letter has recently been written home by one of the senators from Georgia, the Hon. Alfred Iverson, representing the importance of some action by the present Congress on the subject of the tariff. Although non-concurring in some of the views of the letter, there is so much practical wisdom in the following portion of it, that we present it in our editorial columns. Speaking of the action of the caucus of democratic senators on the 5th inst., and of the tariff of 1857, Mr. Iverson says:

"This would leave a deficit of from fifteen to twenty millions annually. How was that to be applied? Either by additional loans or by an increase of the tariff, either on imports or on exports. It was necessary, under the circumstances, wise and proper that the democratic party, now having a majority in both Houses of Congress, should agree upon and arrange such a tariff as would raise sufficient revenue for the wants of the government; such a one as it could stand upon and defend, and thus settle this vexed and perplexing subject at the present session. If we did not, the question would arise again at the next session, even if the next session should be called, and under circumstances greatly more unfavorable to the free trade policy and to the democratic party than at present. The tariff party, the protectionists, would have a decided majority in the next House of Representatives, and would beyond doubt pass such a tariff as would suit them. Could the Senate defeat it? Agreeable to the most favorable calculation, the free-trade or anti-tariff party in the next Senate would not have a majority of more than two or three, and it was doubtful whether they would have a majority at all. It was dangerous, therefore, in my opinion, at least unwise, to turn the subject over to the next Congress. Besides, if the next Senate should be able to defeat a protective tariff sent to it from the House, the subject would form one of the exciting elements of the next presidential election, and would sweep the democratic party from Congress in every tariff State, and probably in every free State in the Union. In my opinion, it was better in every point of view that we should now, whilst we have the power, remodel the tariff to suit our own policy. It could be done by reducing the free list, and making a small addition to dutiable articles. I will vote for any reasonable arrangement which might be deemed necessary, and which might be agreed upon and passed by a majority of both Houses, and as part of a general scheme thus agreed upon, I would be willing to vote for a duty of thirty per cent. on iron, coal, and other similar articles; but I would not vote for any increase of the tariff which was not agreed upon and passed by a majority of both Houses for the wants of the government, and to settle the question at the present session."

"These were the views presented by me in the caucus alluded to. The letter of the Secretary of the Treasury to the House of Representatives a few days ago renders it certain that the tariff must either be remodelled or the national debt increased, without any hope or expectation of diminishing it for many years to come, if ever. My opinion is, that if we do not alter the tariff at this session, it will be altered for us at the next with a vengeance. The future will show whether my counsel to the democratic caucus was wise or not."

We do not perceive how this view of the subject can be gainsayed. It seems to us that no friend of the democratic party can resist this reasoning. It is so plain and truthful a representation of the case that we do not see how a contrary policy can be persisted in than that recommended, unless it be the expression of members to strike a deadly blow at the democratic organization.

We appeal to higher motives, however, than those which refer merely to the success of party; we urge the importance to the great interests of a great country, of providing ample means for conducting its government with energy and vigor during the stirring period in public affairs of which we are apparently at the threshold. The present is one of the most important crises in which the nation of the earth ever found themselves circumstanced. There are rumors of wars in Europe, and some of the wisest heads and most intelligent observers of events now there, announce it as their fixed opinion that all the efforts of the governments of the great European powers will be unable to prevent an outbreak of hostilities which may in the end involve the whole European system.

There are indications, too, of European intervention in the affairs of Mexico, and other portions of our continent, and of a general concentration of the regards of the European powers upon the affairs of this hemisphere. Is this a fit time for manning the hands of our government and depriving it of the sinews of influence and potentiality? Are the great interests of our people and republic on this continent to be sacrificed to the miserable schemes of parties and politicians hatching here in the capital? In order that one of our parties may destroy the other, do the managers on either side prefer that foreign powers may defeat and thwart the interests of our country on our own borders? What has the present Congress done for the country during its existence? It has done much to destroy one party and to build up another. But what has it done to make the American name respected abroad; to establish American interests where they were falling under foreign machination; to increase the American pride in his country and its institutions; to infuse tone and vigor into the American character at home and abroad? It has done nothing—noting.

The effect of its deliberations, on the contrary, has been to lessen the confidence of our own people in their government, and to break down American interests abroad. The administration had done much to attract new credit to our name. The able statesmanship, the astute diplomacy of the President had done much to impress foreign cabinets with the importance of treating all questions in which we had concern with circumspection, and our policy with marked consideration. The policy that has been pursued by Congress has almost neutralized this favorable state of things, and taught Europeans anew that they may deal with America as they would deal with a feeble, unstable, passionate, irresponsible democracy.

A few more days, and, unless something be done to reinstate the public exchequer and reorganize the finances of the country, the government will be in a state of revolution. On the 3d of March approaching the federal government will have reached the precise age allotted to man—of three score years and ten. Every man who had attained to intelligence when it was organized and set in motion under the patriotic direction of the Father of his Country, has now ceased to be numbered among its living citizens. It has passed entirely into the hands of a new generation. Shall the seventieth anniversary of its establishment be the commencement of its disorganization? We trust that those who are threatening the factious proceedings, with the rumors of which the atmosphere is so rife, may consider the consequences of the step they meditate, and allow their patriotic reflections the weight which they should have even with thoughtless politicians and partisans.

## THE STUDENTS AT THE NAVAL SCHOOL.

Mr. SPINNER, of New York, moved to amend the appropriation of \$500,000 for ordnance, ordnance stores, and small arms, so as to provide for the enlargement of the quarters for the accommodation of students at the Naval School at Annapolis; which amendment was ruled out of order by the chairman.

## COMMODORE PAULSON.

Mr. GARNETT, of Virginia, then moved to amend the paragraph appropriating \$250,000 for contingent expenses for reducing it to \$250,000; which amendment was rejected.

## COMMODORE PAULSON.

Mr. COLFAX, of Indiana, moved to add at the end of this paragraph a proviso, that the amount expended by Commodore Paulson, in defense of ships growing out of his arrest of William Walker, shall be paid out of this fund; which was ruled out of order by the chairman.

Mr. COLFAX appealed from the decision of the Chair; and the question being put, the Chair was sustained—aye 69, and nays 56.

## WASHINGTON NAVY-YARD.

Mr. PHELPS, of Missouri, then moved that the appropriation of \$50,750 50 for the Washington navy-yard, be reduced to the sum of \$20,000, the amount being required for gas and gas fixtures; which amendment was agreed to.

## NAVY YARDS.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, then moved that all in relation to navy-yards be stricken out and a paragraph inserted appropriating for the preservation of works and for the current repairs at the several navy-yards: At Portsmouth, N. H., \$10,000; Boston, \$15,000; New York, \$20,000; Philadelphia, \$15,000; Washington, \$10,000; Norfolk, \$20,000; San Francisco, \$20,000; Mare Island, \$1,000; and Sackett's Harbor, \$1,000; pending which—

## NO QUORUM.

Considerable discussion ensued upon a number of amendments to the amendment, until finally the committee found itself without a quorum, and reported the fact to the House.

Mr. BURNETT, of Kentucky, then moved that there be a call of the House; which motion being rejected—aye 42, and nays 52.

Mr. DAYTON, of Mississippi, moved that the House adjourn; which motion did not prevail—yeas 24, nays 87.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SPINNER, of New York, then moved that there be a call of the House; which motion was agreed to.

During the call of the roll, several motions that all further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, and that the House adjourn—were put and decided negatively. Finally, the roll having been called twice, the doors were closed, and pending the call for a second time.

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, remarked that gentlemen who had answered to their names had left the hall since the call of the roll, and he wanted to know whether all further proceedings under the call could be dispensed with and a new one ordered.

Mr. RUPPIN, of North Carolina, thought it was contempt of the House to leave without consent.

Mr. NICHOLS was also of that opinion, when it was necessary to conduct the public business for gentlemen to act in that way. He wanted those, who had left after the call, brought in as well as the absentees.

The SPEAKER suggested that there seemed to be some imperfection in the rules by which the chair was unable to open the doors to prevent access.

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, then moved that all further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, and a new one ordered.

Mr. McQUEEN, of South Carolina, hoped the course indicated by the gentlemen from Ohio would be adopted.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, remarked that the House adjourn; which motion did not prevail.

The motion of Mr. NICHOLS was then agreed to, and the doors were unclosed.

Mr. NICHOLS then moved that there be a call of the House; which motion was agreed to.

The roll was accordingly called through twice, when the doors were closed, and no more than an hour was spent in hearing the excuses of absentees; when—

On motion of Mr. STANTON, of Ohio, the Sergeant-at-Arms was directed to search for absentees and bring them in.

At a quarter to 8 o'clock, the Sergeant-at-Arms presented himself with Messrs. Bates, of Ohio, Wood, of Maine, Clark, of Missouri, and Bryan, of Texas, who were severally excused upon the payment of costs, with the exception of Mr. Clark, who was excused without the payment of costs, being in on account of indisposition.

The other gentlemen were again announced at twenty minutes past 8 o'clock with Mr. Miles, of South Carolina, in custody; at twenty-five minutes past 8 o'clock with Mr. CATANAUGH, of Minnesota; and at half past 8 o'clock with Mr. KUNKEL, of Pennsylvania. Pending the arraignment of these gentlemen—

On motion of Mr. WASHINGTON, of Illinois, the House adjourned—yeas 66, nays 64.

## MEMORIAL.

By Mr. AUGUSTUS B. WRIGHT, of Georgia: The memorial of Thomas A. Jones, now a student at the Naval School at Annapolis, Georgia, praying the imposition of a sufficient penalty day or a duty upon home valuation, or a property arranged "sliding scale," if practically, as the memorialists believe, to be in that order of industry to remain so employed, and to obtain its fair and just reward; referred to the Committee of Ways and Means.

## SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

## FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1859.

On motion of Mr. Attorney General Black, Robert P. Kane and Isaac S. Serrill, esqrs., of Pennsylvania, were admitted attorneys and counsellors of this court.

No. 242. The United States, appellants, vs. Charles Foster. The motion to fix a day for the argument of this case argued by Messrs. Bates and Nelson in support thereof, and by Mr. Attorney General Black in opposition thereto.

No. 284. Sampson and Tappan, claimants of the ship Sarah, &c., appellants, vs. Saml. Welsh &c. The motion to dismiss this cause was argued by Mr. Serrill in support thereof, and by Messrs. Wharton and Kane in opposition thereto.

No. 71. The Board of Commissioners of the County of Knox, plaintiffs in error, vs. David C. Wallace. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. W. Thompson for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. N. C. McLean for the defendant in error.

Adjourned until Monday, 11 o'clock.

CORPORATIONS A FAILURE.—E. B. Bigelow, esq., a practical manufacturer and inventor, issued a pamphlet a few months since on the "Depressed Condition of Manufacturers in Massachusetts." His text was this statement: "Under the present corporate mode of bringing together capital and skill, Massachusetts can never, as a manufacturing community, attain to a high degree of productive power; and our people are consequently in a state of poverty and distress, in comparison with the private enterprise of foreign nations." He says, "in the State of Rhode Island manufacturing from the first has been conducted mainly by private enterprise. Notwithstanding she has been obliged to contend with the over-producing tendencies of her neighbor and rival, she has, on the whole, been more successful than Massachusetts. She is more skillful and better understands the art of economical production. The Slater and the Sprague in the cotton manufacture have a national reputation. The wealthy house of A. & W. Sprague are about starting a new mill of 50,000 spindles. This addition to their manufacturing establishment, already so successful, was projected at a period when the corporation stock of Massachusetts were selling at a heavy discount. Through all the panic they have gone unscathed, and have now nearly reached their successful completion."

MYSTERIOUS VALUE.—A correspondent of the Cincinnati Enquirer at Jackson, Ohio, gives an account of a subterranean vault discovered there, in which the air was so impure that it was impossible for any one to go down into it. By means of a rare human bone of gigantic size have been raised, and a small chain of silver with coins attached to each end. The coins, though much defaced by time, have the appearance of those in use among the Romans in the days of Cicero Africanus, though there were evident traces of hieroglyphic devices that cannot be deciphered.

Henry Granger was the first American who sat in the British House of Commons. He was born in New York city in 1739, and on arriving at manhood became a member of business with his father, who had established himself at Bristol, England, which then had a position relative to America similar to that of Liverpool at the present day. In 1774 he was chosen one of the two representatives to the House of Commons. His colleague was Edmund Burke. He returned to New York city in 1782, and was elected to the State Senate while yet a member of the British House of Commons. He died in New York in 1827.

## THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PHILLIPS said he did not know whether it was or not.

Mr. KITCHIE, of Pennsylvania, remarked that the gentleman did not seem to know precisely which was to be considered the administration.

Mr. PHELPS (reassuming) desired to say that when the gentleman referred to the attempt to ensure the administration contained in this appropriation bill, he asked him to point out the section and clause—

Mr. PHILLIPS (interrupting) said he meant to say the gentleman himself, chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, who voted for the clause put in for the purpose of ensuring the administration.

Mr. PHELPS. The amendment to which the gentleman refers has not been put upon this bill. In giving his vote for it, he was not aware of the administration. It only authorized the administration to give the contractors, not the power of changing the points of departure, but of choosing nearer route to St. Louis than the one upon which they were now travelling. He believed the transmission of mail matter would be expedited from five to seven days, and he had yet to understand that the exact line of a post-route became an administration measure. He would ask whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania had declared he would vote for no more appropriation bills at this session of Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS replied that he had not. He had made up his mind not to vote for this bill, and he meant to carry out his determination.

Mr. PHELPS then inquired whether he had declared he would vote for no more appropriation bills unless the tariff should be amended.

Mr. PHILLIPS replied that he had not.

Mr. PHELPS found no fault with the determination of Mr. PHILLIPS to vote against this appropriation bill, if it was in accordance with the will of his constituents. He then moved the previous question.

The previous question being seconded, the motion that the vote on the bill be taken by yeas and nays was reconsidered was agreed to—yeas 121, nays 67.

Mr. BAIRD, of New York, then moved that the vote by which the amendment of Mr. BRANCH in relation to post office buildings was adopted be reconsidered; pending which—

A brief debate ensued, in which Messrs. BRANCH and SMITH, of Virginia, opposed the amendment of Mr. PHILLIPS authorizing the payment out of the treasury of the deficiencies of the Post Office Department; Mr. Serrill urging that it would relieve the Postmaster General of all necessity for retrenching his expenses, and Messrs. HARRIS and PETERS, of Missouri, replying that the remarks of the former gentleman respecting the Postmaster General could not be construed to mean that the Postmaster General could not disburse money except in pursuance of law.

Mr. PHELPS then demanded the previous question; pending which—

Mr. VANCE, of North Carolina, although he could not vote for the amendment of Mr. BRANCH, moved that the vote by which it was rejected be reconsidered; pending which—

Mr. CRAWFORD, of Georgia, raised a point of order that the motion could not be entertained pending the demand for the previous question.

The SPEAKER decided that the motion could be entertained pending the call for the previous question.

The previous question being seconded, and the question recurring on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of Mr. BRANCH was adopted—

Mr. PHELPS moved the rules be suspended and the House go into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union; pending which—

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, from the select committee appointed to investigate the charge made in the correspondence of the New York Times, and other newspapers, upon a member of the committee on Accounts had received a consideration for reporting favorably upon certain claims brought before that committee, submitted a unanimous report, accompanied by the following resolution:

Resolved, That the testimony elicited by the select committee is insufficient for the conviction of the member implicated (Mr. STANTON) upon the charge specified, neither is the testimony sufficient to warrant his expulsion.

On motion of Mr. NICHOLS, the report and testimony was ordered to be printed, that gentleman remarking that it was his intention to call it up to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The question recurring upon the motion that the House go into committee—

The SPEAKER laid before the House the annual report of the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; which was laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Also, the joint resolutions of the city council of Washington protesting against the passage of the bill before Congress granting further privileges to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company; which was laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Also, communications from the Secretary of the Treasury in reference to the Chickasaw funds, and in answer to a resolution of the House calling for a statement of the amount and disposition of the five-per-cent. funds accruing to the State of Indiana; which were severally laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

The question was then taken, and the motion of Mr. PHELPS agreed to.

The House accordingly went into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, being called in and resumed the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1860, general debate being closed).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BRYAN, of Texas, said in the Globe yesterday, in the report of the discussion on the Globe, it appeared after some remarks which he made upon the forceful condition of Texas, that in reply to the question of Mr. KROGER, "I would like to know where the gentleman from Texas will go when he leaves the Union?"

Mr. REAGAN replied: "Where we once stood, under the Lone Star, and when we go we will take with us the whole of the Gulf States, if not the whole South." He would ask his colleague if those were his sentiments.

Mr. REAGAN said that that announcement had been made by his colleague, and not by himself.

Mr. BRYAN rejoined that his colleague avoided saying whether or not he endorsed the sentiment. If he had been willing to endorse it, he would have been willing to let it appear as his own. They were his words, and he would stand by them.

REPAIRS, ARMAMENT, AND EQUIPMENT.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, moved that the paragraph appropriating \$3,100,000 for the increase, repair, armament, and equipment of the navy, for steamers, and purchased heavy, be stricken out, and a paragraph inserted appropriating for fuel for the navy, to be purchased in the mode prescribed by law, and the transportation thereof \$300,000, for the purchase of hemp and other materials \$1,000,000, for the repair, armament and equipment of vessels \$1,000,000, provided, that no more than \$1,000,000 shall be expended in any navy yard in the repair of any vessels, until the necessity for such repairs and the probable cost thereof is ascertained by the report of a board of not less than three officers of the navy.

Mr. SHERMAN contended that there had been gross abuses in the purchases of these materials, implicating officers of the government, and read from the resolutions of the majority of the select committee, appointed to investigate this subject, to sustain his position.

Mr. PHELPS, of Missouri, opposed the amendment. Referring to the charge of increased expenditure, he said that it had become necessary from the increased service that had been ordered, the increased number of steamers in the service, and the expenses of the Paraguay expedition.

Mr. BRYAN, of Virginia, also opposed the amendment on the ground that it would dilute against the interests of the government, and in reply to the charge that officers of the government had been implicated in the abuses to which the gentleman referred, said that the proof did not rest with Messrs. Sherman and Phillips, but with the government, and that the amendment by increasing the appropriation for fuel to \$750,000, pending which considerable discussion ensued, until, finally—

Mr. GARNETT, of Virginia, moved to amend the original paragraph which it was proposed to strike out by reducing the appropriation to \$2,500,000; which amendment was adopted—yeas 116, nays 75.

During the vote upon this amendment the committee found itself without a quorum, when the roll was called and the fact reported to the House.

The question recurring upon the amendment to the amendment—

Mr. BLISS, of Ohio, moved that the committee rise; which motion did not prevail.

The amendment to the amendment was then rejected; the question being put upon the amendment, it was decided in the negative—yeas 116, nays 75, counted.

Mr. PHILLIPS inquired what the gentleman meant by this public lecture.

Mr. PHELPS replied there were rumors that fifteen democratic members from Pennsylvania would vote for no appropriation bill.

Mr. LEIDY, of Pennsylvania, said so far as that declaration concerned himself it was untrue.

Mr. BRANCH, of North Carolina, understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PHILLIPS) to say there had been an amendment placed in the bill concerning the administration. He desired to ask if he meant this amendment which he had offered.

Mr. PHILLIPS said he had offered the amendment, Mr. BRANCH moved his amendment, Mr.

was not in accordance with the statement made by that gentleman, but was in accordance with the report made by the chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PHILLIPS said he understood him to be speaking of an indirect censure upon the administration. He had voted for the amendment of Mr. BRANCH because he did not believe they were paupers or bankrupts.

Mr. BRANCH understood Mr. PHILLIPS not to have said his amendment was a censure upon the administration.

Mr. PHILLIPS said he did not know whether it was or not.

Mr. KITCHIE, of Pennsylvania, remarked that the gentleman did not seem to know precisely which was to be considered the administration.

Mr. PHELPS (reassuming) desired to say that when the gentleman referred to the attempt to ensure the administration contained in this appropriation bill, he asked him to point out the section and clause—

Mr. PHILLIPS (interrupting) said he meant to say the gentleman himself, chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, who voted for the clause put in for the purpose of ensuring the administration.

Mr. PHELPS. The amendment to which the gentleman refers has not been put upon this bill. In giving his vote for it, he was not aware of the administration. It only authorized the administration to give the contractors, not the power of changing the points of departure, but of choosing nearer route to St. Louis than the one upon which they were now travelling. He believed the transmission of mail matter would be expedited from five to seven days, and he had yet to understand that the exact line of a post-route became an administration measure. He would ask whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania had declared he would vote for no more appropriation bills at this session of Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS replied that he had not. He had made up his mind not to vote for this bill, and he meant to carry out his determination.

Mr. PHELPS then inquired whether he had declared he would vote for no more appropriation bills unless the tariff should be amended.

Mr. PHILLIPS replied that he had not.

Mr. PHELPS found no fault with the determination of Mr. PHILLIPS to vote against this appropriation bill, if it was in accordance with the will of his constituents. He then moved the previous question.

The previous question being seconded, the motion that the vote on the bill be taken by yeas and nays was reconsidered was agreed to—yeas 121, nays 67.

Mr. BAIRD, of New York, then moved that the vote by which the amendment of Mr. BRANCH in relation to post office buildings was adopted be reconsidered; pending which—

A brief debate ensued, in which Messrs. BRANCH and SMITH, of Virginia, opposed the amendment of Mr. PHILLIPS authorizing the payment out of the treasury of the deficiencies of the Post Office Department; Mr. Serrill urging that it would relieve the Postmaster General of all necessity for retrenching his expenses, and Messrs. HARRIS and PETERS, of Missouri, replying that the remarks of the former gentleman respecting the Postmaster General could not be construed to mean that the Postmaster General could not disburse money except in pursuance of law.

Mr. PHELPS then demanded the previous question; pending which—

Mr. VANCE, of North Carolina, although he could not vote for the amendment of Mr. BRANCH, moved that the vote by which it was rejected be reconsidered; pending which—

Mr. CRAWFORD, of Georgia, raised a point of order that the motion could not be entertained pending the demand for the previous question.

The SPEAKER decided that the motion could be entertained pending the call for the previous question.

The previous question being seconded, and the question recurring on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of Mr. BRANCH was adopted—

Mr. PHELPS moved the rules be suspended and the House go into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union; pending which—

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, from the select committee appointed to investigate the charge made in the correspondence of the New York Times, and other newspapers, upon a member of the committee on Accounts had received a consideration for reporting favorably upon certain claims brought before that committee, submitted a unanimous report, accompanied by the following resolution:

Resolved, That the testimony elicited by the select committee is insufficient for the conviction of the member implicated (Mr. STANTON) upon the charge specified, neither is the testimony sufficient to warrant his expulsion.

On motion of Mr. NICHOLS, the report and testimony was ordered to be printed, that gentleman remarking that it was his intention to call it up to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The question recurring upon the motion that the House go into committee—

The SPEAKER laid before the House the annual report of the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; which was laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Also, the joint resolutions of the city council of Washington protesting against the passage of the bill before Congress granting further privileges to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company; which was laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Also, communications from the Secretary of the Treasury in reference to the Chickasaw funds, and in answer to a resolution of the House calling for a statement of the amount and disposition of the five-per-cent. funds accruing to the State of Indiana; which were severally laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

The question was then taken, and the motion of Mr. PHELPS agreed to.

The House accordingly went into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. Jones, of Tennessee, being called in and resumed the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1860, general debate being closed).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BRYAN, of Texas, said in the Globe yesterday, in the report of the discussion on the Globe, it appeared after some remarks which he made upon the forceful condition of Texas, that in reply to the question of Mr. KROGER, "I would like to know where the gentleman from Texas will go when he leaves the Union?"

Mr. REAGAN replied: "Where we once stood, under the Lone Star, and when we go we will take with us the whole of the Gulf States, if not the whole South." He would ask his colleague if those were his sentiments.

Mr. REAGAN said that that announcement had been made by his colleague, and not by himself.

Mr. BRYAN rejoined that his colleague avoided saying whether or not he endorsed the sentiment. If he had been willing to endorse it, he would have been willing to let it appear as his own. They were his words, and he would stand by them.

REPAIRS, ARMAMENT, AND EQUIPMENT.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, moved that the paragraph appropriating \$3,100,000 for the increase, repair, armament, and equipment of the navy, for steamers, and purchased heavy, be stricken out, and a paragraph inserted appropriating for fuel for the navy, to be purchased in the mode prescribed by law, and the transportation thereof \$300,000, for the purchase of hemp and other materials \$1,000,000, for the repair, armament and equipment of vessels \$1,000,000, provided, that no more than \$1,000,000 shall be expended in any navy yard in the repair of any vessels, until the necessity for such repairs and the probable cost thereof is ascertained by the report of a board of not less than three officers of the navy.

Mr. SHERMAN contended that there had been gross abuses in the purchases of these materials, implicating officers of the government, and read from the resolutions of the majority of the select committee, appointed to investigate this subject, to sustain his position.

Mr. PHELPS, of Missouri, opposed the amendment. Referring to the charge of increased expenditure, he said that it had become necessary from the increased service that had been ordered, the increased number of steamers in the service, and the expenses of the Paraguay expedition.